

1 WO  
2  
3  
4  
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 Composite Industrie S.A., a French  
9 corporation,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Vision Air America, Inc.; Artur  
13 Niewiadowski,

14 Defendants.

15 No. CV-13-01984-PHX-JAT

16 **ORDER**

17 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Composite Industrie S.A.'s Motion for  
18 Authorization of Alternative Service of Process on Defendant Artur Niewiadowski  
19 ("Niewiadowski"), pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(1) and Arizona Rule  
20 of Civil Procedure 4.1(k).<sup>1</sup> (Doc. 11). Plaintiff requests that the Court authorize Plaintiff  
21 to serve Niewiadowski with the Summons and Complaint via "(1) posting a copy of the  
22 summons, complaint, and related papers on his residence along with a copy of this  
23 Court's Order allowing for substitute or alternative method of service on [Niewiadowski]  
24 last known residence address and (2) mailing a copy of said papers to the same address."  
(Doc. 11 at 2, 4). To date, no Defendant has appeared in this action.

25 Rule 4(e)(1), Fed. R. Civ. P., allows a summons to be served on an individual in a  
26 manner that follows "state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that, by using all capital letters for party names, the Motion's  
caption violates LRCiv 7(a)(3) ("[P]arty names must be capitalized using proper upper  
and lower case type.").

1 general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is  
 2 made.” Under Arizona law, when personal service has become impracticable, Rule  
 3 4.1(k), Ariz. R. Civ. P., formerly Rule 4.1(m), authorizes service by alternative means as  
 4 follows:

5                   **Alternative or Substituted Service.** If service by one of the  
 6 means set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Rule 4.1 proves *impracticable*, then service may be accomplished in  
 7 such manner, other than by publication, as the court, upon  
 8 motion and without notice, may direct. Whenever the court  
 9 allows an alternate or substitute form of service pursuant to  
 10 this subpart, reasonable efforts shall be undertaken by the  
 11 party making service to assure that actual notice of the  
 12 commencement of the action is provided to the person to be  
 13 served and, in any event, *the summons and the pleading to be  
 14 served, as well as an order of the court authorizing an  
 15 alternative method of service, shall be mailed to the last  
 16 known business or residence address of the person to be  
 17 served.*

18 Rule 4.1(k), Ariz. R. Civ. P. (emphasis added).

19                   Arizona law does not expressly define the standard for  
 20 impracticability, but in 2010, the Arizona Court of Appeals in  
 21 *Blair v. Burgener* approvingly cited the language from a New  
 22 York case on a similar service issue. 245 P.3d 898, 903–04  
 23 ¶¶ 15–17 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2010). “[T]he standard of  
 24 impracticability [i]s ‘different from the more stringent one of  
 25 ‘due diligence’ . . . . That is, to meet the standard on  
 26 impracticability does not require satisfying due diligence, or  
 27 even showing that actual prior attempts to serve a party under  
 28 each and every method provided in the statute have been  
 undertaken[.]” [Id. at 903 ¶ 15] (quoting *Kelly v. Lewis*, 220  
 A.D.2d 485, 486, 632 N.Y.S.2d 186, 186 (App. Div. 1995)).  
 Applying this standard of impracticability, the New York  
 court concluded that three attempts at service on three  
 different days constituted sufficient efforts to warrant  
 alternative means of service. Adopting the same standard, the  
*Blair* court found that *Blair*’s efforts at service without  
 success met the definition of impracticability justifying  
 alternative service. *Blair*’s process server attempted service at  
 both defendants’ place of business and the individual  
 defendant’s residence on five different days at various times.  
 In addition to these physical attempts, the process server  
 attempted to ascertain over an additional seven days whether  
 the individual defendant was present in the office so that  
 service could be made. Each time he was told this defendant  
 was not in the office. These facts and circumstances, the  
 Arizona court concluded, “demonstrate that service of process  
 through the usual means would have been ‘extremely difficult  
 or inconvenient[]’ ” and was impractical which justified the  
 trial court’s authorization of alternative service under Arizona

1 law. [*Id.* at 904 ¶ 18].

2 *BMO Harris Bank, N.A. v. D.R.C. Invs., L.L.C.*, No. CV-13-1692-PHX-LOA, 2013 WL  
 3 4804482, at \*4 (D. Ariz. Sept. 9, 2013).

4 Here, at various times of the day and over the course of eight days, Plaintiff's  
 5 process server attempted service at Niewiadowski's residence three times and at his  
 6 business twice. (Certificate of Non-Service, Doc. 10). Additionally, the process server  
 7 questioned Niewiadowski's executive assistant, who vaguely explained Niewiadowski's  
 8 absences as business trips and would not specify return dates. (*Id.*). Despite the claim that  
 9 Niewiadowski was travelling, after the process server exited Niewiadowski's business for  
 10 the second time, the process server observed an occupant quickly close the business' previously open door. (*Id.*). Moreover, the process server observed a Mercedes vehicle  
 11 registered to Vision Air America, Inc. parked near the business. (*Id.*). The Mercedes' presence is significant because Niewiadowski's neighbor had previously advised the  
 12 process server that Niewiadowski regularly drove a Mercedes. (*Id.*).

13 After consideration of the Motion, the evidence presented, and in view of  
 14 Niewiadowski's apparent evasion of service of process and the futility of further attempts  
 15 to personally serve Niewiadowski, the Court finds service of process on Niewiadowski  
 16 by traditional means is impracticable under Rule 4.1(k), Ariz. R. Civ. P. Accordingly, the  
 17 Court grants Plaintiff's request for alternative service.

18 For the foregoing reasons,

19 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff Composite Industrie S.A.'s Motion for  
 20 Authorization of Alternative Service of Process on Defendant Artur Niewiadowski (Doc.  
 21 11) is GRANTED.

22 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff may serve Niewiadowski by (1) First  
 23 Class U.S. mail, and (2) affixing a copy of the Summons, Complaint, and the Order  
 24 Authorizing Alternative Service to the front door of Niewiadowski's residence located at  
 25 13734 W. Roanoke Avenue, Goodyear, Arizona 85395.

26 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, within 14 days of this Order, Plaintiff must

1 file with the Court satisfactory evidence of mailing and that a copy of the Summons,  
2 Complaint, and this Order were mailed to, and affixed to the front door of,  
3 Niewiadowski's last known residence located at 13734 W. Roanoke Avenue, Goodyear,  
4 Arizona 85395. The provision of this evidence shall be deemed proof of sufficient  
5 evidence that Niewiadowski has been appropriately served with process in this action  
6 pursuant to the applicable procedural rules and the law.

7 **IT IS FINALLY ORDERED** that counsel and any party, if unrepresented, must  
8 hereinafter comply with the Rules of Practice for the United States District Court for the  
9 District of Arizona, including LRCiv 7.1(a)(3) ("[P]arty names must be capitalized using  
10 proper upper and lower case type.") (citing footnote 3 citing a sample of proper  
11 capitalization in Appendix C). The District Court's Rules of Practice may be found on the  
12 District Court's internet web page at [www.azd.uscourts.gov/](http://www.azd.uscourts.gov/).

13 Dated this 25th day of March, 2014.

14  
15  
16   
James A. Teilborg  
Senior United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28